

1 MICHAEL J. STORTZ (SBN 139386)
Michael.Stortz@dbr.com
2 MATTHEW J. ADLER (SBN 273147)
Matthew.Adler@dbr.com
3 DRINKER BIDDLE & REATH LLP
50 Fremont Street, 20th Floor
4 San Francisco, California 94105-2235
Telephone: 415-591-7500
5 Facsimile: 415-591-7510

6 SEAMUS C. DUFFY*
seamus.duffy@dbr.com
7 MICHAEL W. MCTIGUE JR.*
michael.mctigue@dbr.com
8 MEREDITH C. SLAWE*
meredith.slawe@dbr.com
9 DRINKER BIDDLE & REATH LLP
One Logan Square, Ste. 2000
10 Philadelphia, PA 19103-6996
Telephone: (215) 988-2700
11 Facsimile: (215) 988-2757

12 Attorneys for Defendant
COMCAST CABLE COMMUNICATIONS, LLC
13 **pro hac vice* to be sought

14 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
15 NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
16 OAKLAND DIVISION

17
18 BRANDON HODGES, for himself, and all
others similarly situated,

19 Plaintiff,

20 v.

21 COMCAST CABLE COMMUNICATIONS,
22 LLC, a Delaware limited liability company;
and DOES 1-50, inclusive,

23 Defendants.

24 Case No. 4:18-cv-01829-HSG

25
26
27
28
**DEFENDANT'S REPLY
MEMORANDUM IN SUPPORT OF
MOTION TO COMPEL INDIVIDUAL
ARBITRATION AND STAY
LITIGATION**

Date: July 19, 2018
Time: 2:00 p.m.
Ctrm: 2 – 4th Floor
Judge: Hon. Haywood S. Gilliam, Jr.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
I. INTRODUCTION	1
II. ARGUMENT.....	2
A. <i>McGill</i> Does Not Apply Because Plaintiff's Complaint Does Not Seek Public Injunctive Relief	3
B. <i>McGill</i> Does Not Apply Because the Parties' Arbitration Agreement Does Not Require a Waiver "In Any Forum" of Plaintiff's Ability to Seek Public Injunctive Relief.	5
C. Even if <i>McGill</i> Applied, Its Rule is Preempted by the FAA.....	7
1. The <i>McGill</i> Court's Interpretation of Section 3513 Impermissibly Frustrates the FAA's Objectives.....	7
2. <i>McGill</i> 's Preemption Analysis Conflicts with U.S. Supreme Court and Ninth Circuit Precedent.	10
3. The Ninth Circuit's <i>Sakkab</i> Decision Does Not Insulate <i>McGill</i> from Preemption.	12
III. CONCLUSION.....	144

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

	Page(s)
CASES	
<i>Am. Express Co. v. Italian Colors Rest.</i> , 570 U.S. 228 (2013).....	8, 12
<i>AT&T Mobility LLC v. Concepcion</i> , 563 U.S. 333 (2011).....	<i>passim</i>
<i>Broughton v. Cigna Healthplans of Cal.</i> , 988 P.2d 67 (Cal. 1999)	11
<i>Cruz v. PacifiCare Health Sys., Inc.</i> , 66 P.3d 1157 (Cal. 2003)	11
<i>Doctor's Assocs., Inc. v. Casarotto</i> , 517 U.S. 681 (1996).....	8
<i>Ferguson v. Corinthian Colls., Inc.</i> , 733 F.3d 928 (9th Cir. 2013).....	2, 8, 11, 12
<i>Hansberry v. Lee</i> , 311 U.S. 32 (1940).....	13
<i>Hines v. Davidowitz</i> , 312 U.S. 52 (1941).....	3
<i>Kilgore v. KeyBank, Nat'l Ass'n</i> , 718 F.3d 1052 (9th Cir. 2013)	4, 5
<i>Kindred Nursing Ctrs. Ltd. P'ship v. Clark</i> , 137 S. Ct. 1421 (2017)	10, 12
<i>McGill v. Citibank, N.A.</i> , 393 P.3d 85 (Cal. 2017)	<i>passim</i>
<i>Mitsubishi Motors Corp. v. Soler Chrysler-Plymouth, Inc.</i> 473 U.S. 614 (1985).....	11
<i>Phillips Petroleum Co. v. Shutts</i> , 472 U.S. 797 (1985).....	13
<i>Preston v. Ferrer</i> , 552 U.S. 346 (2008).....	8
<i>Rapple v. Portfolio Recovery Assocs., LLC</i> , No. 17-0108, 2017 WL 3835259 (C.D. Cal. Aug. 24, 2017).....	5

1	<i>Sakkab v. Luxottica Retail North America, Inc.</i> , 803 F.3d 425 (9th Cir. 2015).....	2, 13, 14
2		
3	<i>Tillage v. Comcast Corp.</i> , No. 17-cv-06477-VC (N.D. Cal. Feb. 15, 2018).....	7
4		
5	<i>Trout v. Comcast Cable Commc'ns, LLC</i> , No. 17-cv-01912 (N.D. Cal. Mar. 15, 2018).....	1, 7
6		
7	<i>Wright v. Sirius XM Radio, Inc.</i> , No. 16-1688, 2017 WL 4676580 (C.D. Cal. June 1, 2017)	5
8		
9	STATUTES, RULES & REGULATIONS	
10	9 U.S.C. § 2.....	7, 8
11	9 U.S.C. § 10.....	9
12	California Civil Code § 3513	<i>passim</i>
13		
14		
15		
16		
17		
18		
19		
20		
21		
22		
23		
24		
25		
26		
27		
28		

I. INTRODUCTION

Plaintiff Brandon Hodges (“Plaintiff”) does not dispute Comcast’s showing that he accepted the Comcast Agreement for Residential Services (“Subscriber Agreement,” Wade Decl., Ex. 6 (ECF No. 8-6)), including the arbitration agreement therein. Nor does Plaintiff dispute Comcast’s showing that he could have opted out of the arbitration agreement but did not, or Comcast’s further showing that the scope of the arbitration agreement encompasses his claims in this case.

Instead, Plaintiff challenges enforcement of the arbitration agreement based on a single argument that the agreement is unenforceable under California Civil Code section 3513, as construed in *McGill v. Citibank, N.A.*, 393 P.3d 85 (Cal. 2017). *McGill* held that Section 3513 operated to invalidate an agreement that waived, *in any forum* (i.e., in court, in arbitration, or otherwise), the right to assert claims for public injunctive relief. *See id.* at 93–94.

But Plaintiff's argument fails, for at least three reasons:

First, *McGill* does not apply because Plaintiff does not seek public injunctive relief. He instead asserts claims for private class-wide relief under federal and California statutes. The injunctive relief he has pled in his Complaint is not on behalf of the public, but rather on behalf of a putative class of Comcast cable subscribers. Accordingly, his attempt to invoke *McGill* fails as a matter of law.

Second, even if Plaintiff sought public injunctive relief (which he does not), the Subscriber Agreement and its arbitration agreement do not preclude a request for public injunctive relief “in any forum.” As Plaintiff is aware, the arbitration agreement specifically provides (and has at all relevant times provided) that a subscriber may opt out of arbitration. Under the plain terms of the Subscriber Agreement, a subscriber who has properly and timely opted out may thereafter pursue claims for public injunctive relief in court. *McGill* is therefore inapposite, as Judge Seeborg of this Court recently held in granting Comcast’s motion to compel arbitration. *See Trout v. Comcast Cable Commc’ns, LLC*, No. 17-cv-01912-RS, Order (ECF No. 47) at 6 (N.D. Cal. Mar. 15, 2018) (“Comcast is on solid ground . . . in pointing out that critical to the *McGill* decision was the fact that the arbitration provision in that case purported to waive the plaintiff’s right to seek public injunctive relief in any forum. Here, in contrast, not only does the arbitration provision lack any similar

1 language, Comcast customers also were free to elect not to be bound by the arbitration agreement.”
 2 (internal citation omitted)).¹

3 *Third*, to the extent the *McGill* rule is found to apply, it is preempted by the Federal
 4 Arbitration Act (“FAA”). *See, e.g., Ferguson v. Corinthian Colls., Inc.*, 733 F.3d 928, 934–35 (9th
 5 Cir. 2013) (“[W]here a specific remedy has implications for the public at large, it must be arbitrated
 6 under the FAA if the parties have agreed to arbitrate it.”). Plaintiff fails even to cite, much less to
 7 address, the controlling *Ferguson* precedent. Moreover, Plaintiff’s purported reliance on *Sakkab v.*
 8 *Luxottica Retail North America, Inc.*, 803 F.3d 425 (9th Cir. 2015) is unavailing as (among other
 9 things) that case did not involve class claims for injunctive relief.

10 Plaintiff fails to provide any basis to avoid compliance with the parties’ arbitration
 11 agreement and, therefore, the Court should grant Comcast’s Motion to Compel Individual
 12 Arbitration and Stay Litigation.

13 **II. ARGUMENT**

14 The only ground on which Plaintiff opposes arbitration is California Civil Code
 15 section 3513 (“Section 3513”),² as construed in *McGill*. In *McGill*, the California Supreme Court
 16 addressed whether Citibank’s arbitration clause, which, the parties *stipulated*, precluded public
 17 injunctive relief claims “in any forum,” was valid in light of this stipulation. 393 P.3d at 87 (“The
 18 question we address in this case is the validity of a provision in a predispute arbitration agreement
 19 that waives the right to seek this statutory remedy [(i.e., public injunctive relief)] in any forum.”).
 20 Citing Section 3513, the court held that “insofar as the arbitration provision here purports to waive
 21 McGill’s right to request *in any forum* such public injunctive relief, it is invalid and unenforceable
 22 under California law.” *Id.* at 93–94 (emphasis added).

23 *McGill* does not disturb the enforceability of the parties’ arbitration agreement here for at
 24 least three reasons. *First*, *McGill* is inapposite because Plaintiff’s Complaint does not assert a claim

25 ¹ A copy of the *Trout* Order granting Comcast’s motion to compel arbitration and stay
 26 litigation is attached as Exhibit 1 to the accompanying Stortz Declaration. *See* Declaration of
 27 Michael J. Stortz (“Stortz Decl.”) ¶ 2 & Ex. 1.

28 ² The statute provides, “[a]ny one may waive the advantage of a law intended solely for his
 benefit. But a law established for a public reason cannot be contravened by a private agreement.”
 Cal. Civ. Code § 3513.

1 for “public” injunctive relief. Unlike cases in which plaintiff sought injunctive relief on behalf of
 2 the general public, Plaintiff’s claims challenge alleged Comcast practices that are directed to and
 3 affect **only** Comcast cable subscribers. **Second**, *McGill* does not apply to the parties’ arbitration
 4 agreement because the decision, by its terms, applies only to cases in which an agreement seeks to
 5 bar a party from asserting a claim for public injunctive relief “in any forum.” *See id.* at 90. The
 6 parties’ arbitration agreement here does no such thing because it affords subscribers the right to opt
 7 out of arbitration. **Third**, to the extent that *McGill* is found to apply on the facts of this case, its
 8 construction of Section 3513 is preempted by the FAA “[b]ecause it ‘stands as an obstacle to the
 9 accomplishment and execution of the full purposes and objectives of Congress,’” in enacting the
 10 FAA. *AT&T Mobility LLC v. Concepcion*, 563 U.S. 333, 352 (2011) (quoting *Hines v. Davidowitz*,
 11 312 U.S. 52, 67 (1941)). These points are discussed in turn below.

12 **A. McGill Does Not Apply Because Plaintiff’s Complaint Does Not Seek Public**
 13 **Injunctive Relief.**

14 In order to invoke *McGill*, Plaintiff argues that he has asserted claims for public injunctive
 15 relief under the UCL, CIPA, and the Cable Act. But a review of the Complaint confirms that
 16 Plaintiff does not seek injunctive relief on behalf of the public, but rather seeks private relief
 17 intended to benefit Comcast cable subscribers like himself. *See* Compl., Prayer for Relief ¶¶ 1(a)–
 18 (g); Pl.s’ Mem. of Points and Authorities in Opp’n (ECF No. 18) (“Pl.’s Opp’n”) at 8–9
 19 (enumerating Plaintiff’s requests for injunctive relief, each of which pertains solely to Comcast
 20 “cable subscribers”). As the court stated in *McGill*, “public injunctive relief . . . is relief that has the
 21 **primary purpose** and effect of prohibiting unlawful acts that threaten future injury to the general
 22 public. Relief that has the primary purpose or effect of redressing or preventing injury to an
 23 individual plaintiff—or to a **group of individuals similarly situated** to the plaintiff—does not
 24 constitute public injunctive relief.” *McGill*, 393 P.3d at 90 (emphasis added) (internal quotation
 25 marks and citation omitted); *cf. id.* at 93 (claim for public injunctive relief “does not constitute” a
 26 claim for class-wide relief). Stated differently, relief that would vindicate the interests of a defined
 27 subset of the population is not public injunctive relief. Instead, it is private injunctive relief on
 28 behalf of a putative class.

1 Against this backdrop, the injunctive relief that Plaintiff requests here is not public
 2 injunctive relief. It would not even have the primary purpose of affecting the entire Comcast
 3 subscriber base, much less the general public as a whole. Rather, Plaintiff seeks injunctive relief
 4 that would only affect a subset of Comcast subscribers: those who subscribe to Comcast **cable**
 5 service. *See* Compl., Prayer for Relief ¶¶ 1(a)–(g) (seeking injunctive relief requiring Comcast to
 6 take certain action vis-à-vis its “cable subscribers”); *see also id.* ¶ 25 (defining the purported class
 7 as “[a]ll persons in California with a residential Comcast cable television subscription at any time
 8 during the applicable statutory limitations period(s)”). For example, Plaintiff seeks an injunction
 9 requiring Comcast to “stop using its cable system to collect **cable subscribers’** personally
 10 identifiable video activity data . . . without . . . consent”; to “destroy all personally identifiable video
 11 activity data collected from **cable subscribers** . . . without . . . consent”; and to “change its
 12 procedures to provide **cable subscribers** who request access to their PII with access to all such PII
 13 in Comcast’s possession.” Pl.’s Opp’n at 8 (emphasis added). This relief, if granted, would affect
 14 only Comcast **cable** subscribers, i.e., the putative class, rather than the general public. *See, e.g.,*
 15 *Kilgore v. KeyBank, Nat’l Ass’n*, 718 F.3d 1052, 1060–61 (9th Cir. 2013) (finding plaintiffs did not
 16 seek public injunctive relief under the UCL where, among other factors, “there [was] no real
 17 prospective benefit to the public at large from the relief sought”).

18 Plaintiff argues otherwise, asserting that his requests for injunctive relief “will primarily
 19 benefit the public (rather than the plaintiff) because . . . cable operators’ privacy violations are
 20 widespread, systemic offenses that threaten ongoing injury to the general public.” Pl.s Opp’n at 14.
 21 Whatever that may mean, Plaintiff cannot credibly equate Comcast cable subscribers, or even all
 22 Comcast subscribers, with the general public. Plaintiff contends that the relief sought will benefit
 23 not only Comcast’s “existing customers”—who he acknowledges are putative class members—but
 24 also Comcast’s “prospective customers,” who are not part of the putative class. *Id.* at 15. He
 25 references a 2017 Annual Report that, he claims, shows there are “at least 1.25 million total”
 26 Comcast customers in California. *Id.* Putting aside the fact that the cable-subscriber subset of this
 27 group would be even smaller, classifying a group of 1.25 million individuals as the “general public”
 28 would ignore the 37.5 million non-Comcast cable subscribers who call California home. As such,

1 the number of Comcast subscribers in California provides no basis to conclude that Plaintiff's
 2 requested injunctive relief would have the primary purpose of benefitting the public at large.

3 Moreover, the core test is not whether any member of the general public might ultimately
 4 benefit from the requested relief, but whether the requested injunctive relief would have the
 5 ***primary purpose*** of preventing injury to the public. *McGill*, 393 P.3d at 90; *see also Kilgore*, 718
 6 F.3d at 1060–61. Plaintiff's requested injunctive relief, none of which even refers to “prospective
 7 customers,” does not and cannot satisfy this test—*even if* some unspecified portion of the “public”
 8 might be affected incidentally.

9 Accordingly, *McGill* is inapposite. Courts assessing the scope of *McGill* have found that it
 10 does not prohibit enforcement of a plaintiff's arbitration agreement where, as here, the plaintiff
 11 “only seeks private relief” which would “solely benefit the putative class members,” and “any
 12 benefit to the public is merely incidental.” *Wright v. Sirius XM Radio, Inc.*, No. 16-1688, 2017 WL
 13 4676580, at *9 (C.D. Cal. June 1, 2017) (internal quotation marks and citations omitted); *see also*
 14 *Rappley v. Portfolio Recovery Assocs., LLC*, No. 17-0108, 2017 WL 3835259, at *6 (C.D. Cal.
 15 Aug. 24, 2017) (“[T]he relief Plaintiff seeks is not designed to prevent future harm to the public at
 16 large, but is rather intended to redress prior and future injury to a specific group of putative
 17 plaintiffs who have a debt defaulted on and subsequently purchased by [defendant].” (citations
 18 omitted)); *Kilgore*, 718 F.3d at 1060–61.

19 Because Plaintiff's starting premise—that the injunctive relief he seeks is public—is
 20 demonstrably false, *McGill* does not apply and does not prevent enforcement of the arbitration
 21 agreement.

22 **B. *McGill* Does Not Apply Because the Parties' Arbitration Agreement Does Not**
 23 **Require a Waiver “In Any Forum” of Plaintiff's Ability to Seek Public Injunctive**
 24 **Relief.**

25 *McGill* also does not apply to Plaintiff's claims at issue here because the parties' arbitration
 26 agreement does ***not*** require Plaintiff to waive—“in any forum”—his ability to seek public
 27 injunctive relief.

28 In *McGill*, the parties stipulated that Citibank's arbitration clause precluded Plaintiff from
 seeking public injunctive relief “in any forum.” 393 P.3d at 90 (“Given the parties' agreement, we

1 do not independently analyze the arbitration provision, but proceed based on the parties' shared
 2 view that it purports to preclude McGill from seeking public injunctive relief in arbitration, in court,
 3 or *in any forum.*" (emphasis in original)).³ Thus, the only issue *McGill* addressed was the validity
 4 of any agreement that, as the parties stipulated, waives a party's right to seek public injunctive relief
 5 "in any forum." *Id.* at 87.

6 In contrast, Comcast vigorously disputes that the parties' arbitration agreement effects such
 7 a universal waiver. Instead, the provision provides that new subscribers can opt out of the
 8 arbitration agreement within 30 days of their first Xfinity service activation. *See* Wade Decl., Ex. 6
 9 § 13(d); *see also* Comcast's Mem. of Points and Authorities (ECF No. 7) at 5. The opt-out
 10 provision states (in all capital letters),

11 IF YOU DO NOT WISH TO ARBITRATE DISPUTES, YOU MAY DECLINE
 12 TO HAVE YOUR DISPUTES WITH US ARBITRATED BY NOTIFYING US,
 13 WITHIN 30 DAYS OF YOUR FIRST XFINITY SERVICE ACTIVATION, BY
 14 VISITING WWW.XFINITY.COM/ARBITRATIONOPTOUT, OR IN WRITING
 15 BY MAIL YOUR DECISION TO OPT OUT OF THIS ARBITRATION
 16 PROVISION WILL HAVE NO ADVERSE EFFECT ON YOUR
 17 RELATIONSHIP WITH [COMCAST] OR SERVICE(S) PROVIDED BY US. IF
 18 YOU HAVE PREVIOUSLY OPTED OUT OF ARBITRATION WITH RESPECT
 TO THE ACCOUNT GOVERNED BY THIS AGREEMENT, YOU DO NOT
 NEED TO DO SO AGAIN. YOU MUST SEPARATELY OPT OUT FOR EACH
 ACCOUNT UNDER WHICH YOU RECEIVE SERVICES. ANY OPTOUTS
 SUBMITTED AFTER THIS PERIOD WILL NOT BE CONSIDERED
 EFFECTIVE.

19 Wade Decl., Ex. 6, § 13(d) (typography in original).⁴

20 By its terms, Comcast's arbitration agreement thus permits its subscribers to elect either the
 21 faster, less expensive, and purely bilateral process afforded by arbitration, or the more cumbersome
 22 procedures and broader scope of potential relief afforded by judicial or other non-arbital

23 ³ Accordingly, the *McGill* court had no occasion to consider how the presence of an opt-out
 24 clause (which the Citibank agreement did in fact contain) altered the Section 3513 analysis.
See 393 P.3d at 88 (describing opt-out provision).

25 ⁴ Plaintiff's Subscriber Agreement does not provide a renewed opportunity to opt out for
 26 existing customers; however, each of Plaintiff's prior Subscriber Agreements in effect at the time
 27 of installation of his services provided an opportunity to opt out of the arbitration agreement
 28 within 30 days of his first receiving the Agreement. *See id.*, Ex. 1 § 13(c); *id.*, Ex. 2 § 13(c); *id.*,
 Ex. 3 § 13(c). Plaintiff does not dispute that he did not opt out of arbitration after receiving any
 of these versions of the Agreement. *See generally* Pl.'s Opp'n.

1 proceedings. In light of that choice, which the California Supreme Court was **not** called upon to
 2 address in *McGill*, that court's holding does not apply to—much less void—Comcast's arbitration
 3 agreement.

4 Indeed, a recent decision from this Court determined that the opt-out provision in Comcast's
 5 arbitration agreement meant there was no universal waiver of claims for public injunctive relief—
 6 and thus *McGill* did not prevent enforcement of the agreement. *See Trout* Order (Ex. 1 to Stortz
 7 Decl.) at 4, 6. In reasoning that applies in full here, Judge Seeborg explained that:

8 Comcast is on solid ground . . . in pointing out that critical to the *McGill* decision
 9 was the fact that the arbitration provision in that case purported to waive the
 10 plaintiff's right to seek public injunctive relief in *any forum*. Here, in contrast, not
 only does the arbitration provision lack any similar language, ***Comcast customers
 also were free to elect not to be bound*** by the arbitration agreement.

11 *Id.* at 6 (boldface emphasis added) (internal citation omitted).⁵ Curiously, Plaintiff does not address
 12 the *Trout* decision, much less the fact that he could have opted out of arbitration. But it is precisely
 13 the opt-out opportunity that renders his *McGill* argument misplaced. This Court should follow the
 14 *Trout* decision and conclude that the parties' arbitration agreement does not require a waiver of
 15 public injunctive relief “in any forum.”

16 **C. Even if *McGill* Applied, Its Rule is Preempted by the FAA.**

17 **1. The *McGill* Court's Interpretation of Section 3513 Impermissibly Frustrates
 18 the FAA's Objectives.**

19 Finally, even if *McGill* applies here—which it does not—its rule is preempted by the
 20 FAA. The FAA provides:

21 A written provision in any maritime transaction or a contract evidencing a
 22 transaction involving commerce to settle by arbitration a controversy thereafter
 23 arising out of such contract or transaction . . . shall be valid, irrevocable, and
 24 enforceable, save upon such grounds as exist at law or in equity for the revocation
 25 of any contract.

26 9 U.S.C. § 2. Pursuant to the Supremacy Clause of the U.S. Constitution, when a law conflicts
 27 with the FAA, the conflicting state rule is displaced by the FAA through the doctrine of

28 ⁵ Notably, this issue was not addressed in *Tillage v. Comcast Corporation*. *See* No. 17-cv-
 06477-VC, Order (ECF No. 37) (N.D. Cal. Feb. 15, 2018).

1 preemption. *See Preston v. Ferrer*, 552 U.S. 346, 353 (2008). Not all state rules affecting the
 2 validity of arbitration agreements are preempted by the FAA. State rules that “exist at law or in
 3 equity for the revocation of any contract” are valid and applicable to arbitration agreements.
 4 9 U.S.C. § 2. Thus, the “savings clause” of Section 2 of the FAA “permits agreements to be
 5 invalidated by ‘generally applicable contract defenses, such as fraud, duress, or
 6 unconscionability,’ but not by defenses that apply only to arbitration or that derive their meaning
 7 from the fact that an agreement to arbitrate is at issue.” *Concepcion*, 563 U.S. at 339 (quoting
 8 *Doctor’s Assocs., Inc. v. Casarotto*, 517 U.S. 681, 687 (1996)). As explained in *Concepcion*,
 9 however, even a “generally applicable” rule of state contract law that would otherwise be valid
 10 under the FAA’s savings clause is preempted if it (1) “interferes with fundamental attributes of
 11 arbitration,” such as lower costs, simplified procedures, and a reasonably ascertainable scope of
 12 potential liability, or (2) is “applied in a fashion that disfavors arbitration.” 563 U.S. at 341, 344,
 13 348–50. In short, a state law is preempted when it “frustrates the FAA’s purposes and
 14 objectives.” *Ferguson*, 733 F.3d at 936 (quoting *Am. Express Co. v. Italian Colors Rest.*, 570
 15 U.S. 228, 251 (2013) (Kagan, J., dissenting)).

16 To the extent that *McGill* applies here—which it does not—it is preempted by the FAA
 17 for three reasons.

18 *First*, the *McGill* rule does not fall within the savings clause of Section 2 of the FAA.
 19 Plaintiff argues that the *McGill* rule is a generally applicable contract defense because it “do[es]
 20 not apply only to arbitration or derive [its] meaning from the fact that an agreement to arbitrate is
 21 at issue.” Pl.’s Opp’n at 17. The *McGill* rule, however, does not provide for “revocation” of a
 22 contract, nor does it address issues relating to the formation of the agreement. *See Concepcion*,
 23 563 U.S. at 355 (Thomas, J., concurring) (reading Section 2 to “require enforcement of an
 24 agreement to arbitrate unless a party successfully asserts a defense concerning the formation of
 25 the agreement”). The *McGill* rule thus does not fall within the savings clause at all, and it is
 26 preempted by the FAA.

27 *Second*, even if the *McGill* rule is construed as a generally applicable rule, it is preempted
 28 by the FAA because it interferes with fundamental attributes of arbitration. As the U.S. Supreme

1 Court has explained, subjecting defendants to public injunction claims in arbitration “greatly
 2 increases risks to [those] defendants”; the “absence of multilayered review [of arbitral awards]
 3 makes it more likely that errors will go uncorrected.” *Concepcion*, 563 U.S. at 350. “Defendants
 4 are willing to accept the costs of these errors in arbitration,” the Court explained, “since their
 5 impact is limited to the size of individual disputes, and presumably outweighed by savings from
 6 avoiding the courts.” *Id.* But when the claim at issue is not merely the complaint of an individual
 7 but instead the “damages allegedly owed to tens of thousands of potential claimants”—or, in the
 8 case of a public injunction, relief for every California resident—“the risk of an error will often
 9 become unacceptable. Faced with even a small chance of a devastating loss, defendants will be
 10 pressured into settling questionable claims.” *Id.* Stated differently, being forced to arbitrate
 11 public injunctive relief claims would potentially convert every “bilateral” arbitration into a bet-
 12 the-company matter. And that, in turn, would dramatically increase defendants’ costs—which
 13 would operate as yet another lever for plaintiffs and their counsel to use to secure a settlement.
 14 *See id.* at 348 (citing “lower costs” and “greater efficiency” as two cardinal virtues of “bilateral
 15 arbitration”); *id.* at 350–51 (discussing the limited judicial review available under the FAA and
 16 “find[ing] it hard to believe that defendants would bet the company with no effective means of
 17 review, and even harder to believe that Congress would have intended to allow state courts to
 18 force such a decision”).

19 Additionally, an arbitral system in which any plaintiff may seek public injunctive relief
 20 subjects defendants to the risk of multiple, overlapping, and inconsistent injunctions on the very
 21 same set of claims. There is no established mechanism, for example, for a single authority to
 22 reconcile all injunctions issued against a particular defendant. And given the circumscribed
 23 nature of judicial review available under the FAA, *see* 9 U.S.C. § 10; *Concepcion*, 563 U.S. at
 24 350–51 (“[R]eview under § 10 focuses on misconduct rather than mistake.”), the courts cannot
 25 perform such a reconciliation. Such a system, in other words, “is not arbitration as envisioned by
 26 the FAA . . . and therefore may not be required by state law.” *Concepcion*, 563 U.S. at 351.

27
 28

1 *Third*, the *McGill* rule “disfavors arbitration.” *Concepcion*, 563 U.S. at 341. As
 2 explained in *Concepcion*, when a state-law rule sufficiently alters the foundational cost-benefit
 3 analysis that underlies parties’ decisions to draft and invoke arbitration clauses, those parties
 4 “would have less incentive to continue resolving potentially duplicative claims on an individual
 5 basis.” *Id.* at 347. Put differently, if a defendant knows that it will face either (1) a steady stream
 6 of “individual” claims for public injunctive relief in a stripped-down, limited-review arbitral
 7 forum; or (2) a litigated class or representative action in which it may have the benefit of formal
 8 rules of evidence and procedure, substantive appellate review, and claim- and issue-preclusion
 9 principles, it will not be long before defendants avoid arbitration altogether. A rule that forces
 10 such an illusory choice is a textbook example of “disfavor[ing] arbitration” in a manner
 11 prohibited by the FAA. *Id.* at 341. Moreover, the *McGill* rule “would have a disproportionate
 12 impact on arbitration agreements,” *Concepcion*, 563 U.S. at 342, running afoul of the Supreme
 13 Court’s warning against “any rule that covertly” disfavors arbitration. *Kindred Nursing Ctrs. Ltd.*
 14 *P’ship v. Clark*, 137 S. Ct. 1421, 1426 (2017). Because the *McGill* rule serves no other purpose
 15 than to invalidate arbitration agreements that California deems contrary to public policy, the rule
 16 disfavors arbitration and is preempted.

17 Thus, “[b]ecause it ‘stands as an obstacle to the accomplishment and execution of the full
 18 purposes and objectives of Congress,’ California’s [interpretation of Section 3513 in *McGill*] is
 19 preempted by the FAA.” *Id.* at 352 (citation omitted).

20 **2. *McGill’s Preemption Analysis Conflicts with U.S. Supreme Court and Ninth
 21 Circuit Precedent.***

22 Although the Ninth Circuit and U.S. Supreme Court have not yet squarely confronted the
 23 preemption question posed by *McGill*,⁶ the Ninth Circuit *has* previously addressed FAA
 24 preemption of requests for public injunctive relief. Specifically, in *Ferguson*, the Ninth Circuit

25
 26 ⁶ This question is presented in four appeals currently pending before the Ninth Circuit.
 27 *See McArdle v. AT&T Mobility LLC*, No. 17-17246 (9th Cir. filed Nov. 2, 2017); *Blair v. Rent-A-
 28 Ctr., Inc.*, No. 17-17221 (9th Cir. filed Oct. 30, 2017); *Tillage v. Comcast Corp.*, No. 18-15288
 (9th Cir. filed Feb. 22, 2018); *Roberts v. AT&T Mobility LLC*, No. 18-15593 (9th Cir. filed Apr.
 6, 2018).

1 held that the California Supreme Court's *Broughton-Cruz* rule—which declared that contracts
 2 seeking to compel arbitration of claims for public injunctive relief were void as contrary to public
 3 policy—was preempted by the FAA. *See Ferguson*, 733 F.3d at 932–33 (discussing *Broughton v.*
 4 *Cigna Healthplans of Cal.*, 988 P.2d 67 (Cal. 1999) and *Cruz v. PacifiCare Health Sys., Inc.*, 66
 5 P.3d 1157 (Cal. 2003)); *Ferguson*, 733 F.3d at 937. The *McGill* court's contrary conclusion is
 6 inconsistent with the rule and reasoning of the Ninth Circuit in *Ferguson*—and therefore cannot
 7 stand—for three distinct but related reasons.

8 **First**, the *McGill* court relied heavily on the “effective vindication” doctrine in finding no
 9 FAA preemption. The court cited U.S. Supreme Court decisions holding that, “[b]y agreeing to
 10 arbitrate a statutory claim, a party does not forgo the substantive rights afforded by the statute; it
 11 only submits to their resolution in an arbitral, rather than a judicial, forum.” *Mitsubishi Motors*
 12 *Corp. v. Soler Chrysler-Plymouth, Inc.* 473 U.S. 614, 628 (1985); *see McGill*, 393 P.3d at 95.
 13 But as the Ninth Circuit concluded in *Ferguson*, “that analysis does not apply to state statutes
 14 such as those that form the basis of Plaintiffs’ request for a public injunction.” 733 F.3d at 935–
 15 36. That is because the doctrine “rest[s] on the principle that other **federal** statutes stand on equal
 16 footing with the FAA.” *Id.* at 936 (emphasis added). Pursuant to the Supremacy Clause,
 17 however, **state** statutes are categorically placed on **inferior** footing and therefore are not saved
 18 from preemption by the respect that the FAA affords to claims grounded in federal law. *See id.*

19 **Second**, the *McGill* court invoked state-law-based policy considerations, such as the state
 20 legislature’s purported desire to broaden enforcement of the state’s consumer-protection laws.
 21 *McGill*, 393 P.3d at 97. *Ferguson*, however, reiterated the U.S. Supreme Court’s directive that
 22 States cannot enforce rules that “disfavor arbitration,” even if those rules are “‘desirable for
 23 unrelated reasons.’” 733 F.3d at 936 (quoting *Concepcion*, 563 U.S. at 351).

24 **Third**, whereas *McGill* takes a formalistic approach to the preemption analysis and often
 25 relies on out-of-context quotations from various Supreme Court decisions,⁷ *Ferguson* employs a

26 ⁷ See *McGill*, 393 P.3d at 95 (quoting *Mitsubishi Motors*, 473 U.S. at 628, 637 n.19, on the
 27 (inapposite) effective-vindication doctrine); *McGill*, 393 P.3d at 97 (asserting that *Concepcion*
 28 “actually support[s] the draw[ing] of a distinction between class claims and public injunctions”
 because class actions are a procedural device and public injunctions are a substantive remedy

1 straightforward analysis that tracks the traditional preemption test—namely, ““asking whether the
 2 state law frustrates the FAA’s purposes and objectives.”” 733 F.3d at 936 (quoting *Italian*
 3 *Colors*, 570 U.S. at 251 (Kagan, J., dissenting)); *see also Kindred Nursing*, 137 S. Ct. at 1428-29
 4 (rejecting plaintiffs’ formalistic FAA preemption argument).⁸

5 Here, the *McGill* court’s interpretation of Section 3513 clearly “frustrates the FAA’s
 6 purposes and objectives,” as it overrides the parties’ voluntary, bilateral agreement to settle their
 7 disputes *as private parties* in a less formal, less procedure-heavy forum. *See Italian Colors*, 570
 8 U.S. at 251; *Concepcion*, 563 U.S. at 348. If Section 3513, as construed by *McGill*, precludes a
 9 voluntary agreement between private parties to resolve disputes either (a) individually (in an
 10 informal, less procedurally-heavy arbitral forum) or (b) in an individual, class, collective, or
 11 representative action (in a formal, procedurally-heavy judicial forum), then Section 3513
 12 indisputably “frustrates the FAA’s purposes and objectives” and is preempted.

13 Thus, even if *McGill* applied to this case—which it does not, due to Plaintiff not
 14 requesting public injunctive relief and the opt-out right in the parties’ arbitration agreement—this
 15 Court should find that Section 3513 as construed by *McGill* is preempted by the FAA.

16 **3. The Ninth Circuit’s *Sakkab* Decision Does Not Insulate *McGill* from
 17 Preemption.**

18 In a final fallback argument, Plaintiff argues that his claims are of a piece with the Private
 19 Attorneys General Act (“PAGA”) claims at issue in the Ninth Circuit’s *Sakkab* decision and
 20 therefore are not preempted. Plaintiff errs in two respects.

21 *First*, Plaintiff dramatically over-reads *Sakkab*. In that case, the Ninth Circuit concluded
 22 that *PAGA* actions were sufficiently distinct from *class* actions such that the Supreme Court’s
 23 *Concepcion* decision did not apply. Specifically, the *Sakkab* court concluded that whereas a
 24 class-action plaintiff acts as a proxy for other injured parties, a PAGA plaintiff is “the proxy or

25 (internal quotation marks omitted)). *Contra Ferguson*, 733 F.3d at 934 (“reject[ing] the argument
 26 that because an injunction is technically a remedy rather than a cause of action, the *Broughton-*
 27 *Cruz* rule is insulated from the FAA”).

28 ⁸ The *McGill* decision studiously avoids any mention of *Ferguson*, notwithstanding that the
 Ninth Circuit’s preemption analysis in *Ferguson* is diametrically opposed to the preemption
 discussion in *McGill*—and reaches the opposite conclusion.

1 agent *of the state's labor law enforcement agencies*, who are the *real parties in interest*.” 803
 2 F.3d at 435 (emphasis added) (internal quotation marks and citation omitted); *id.* (explaining that
 3 “PAGA does not give absent employees any substantive right to bring their ‘own’ PAGA
 4 claims.”). Thus, in no way can Plaintiff be viewed as a quasi-government representative or
 5 PAGA plaintiff.

6 Indeed, a public injunction action is clearly distinguishable from a PAGA claim and has
 7 much more in common with a traditional class action. For example, because a PAGA action
 8 involves only a claim by the *sovereign*, the procedures required to arbitrate such a claim could be
 9 nearly as streamlined as in any commercial arbitration. *See id.* at 436. But because a public
 10 injunction claim (like a class action) seeks to protect the rights and interests of absent parties, the
 11 Due Process Clause would impose additional procedural requirements that would prevent a
 12 “public injunction arbitration” from offering the “efficient, streamlined procedures” that truly
 13 bilateral arbitration typically promises. *Concepcion*, 563 U.S. at 344.⁹ Similarly, a PAGA
 14 claim—even a high-value one—is a one-and-done affair, whereas a public injunction claim likely
 15 would impose indefinite compliance obligations, likely involve perpetual arbitral oversight, and
 16 potentially imbue *millions* of individuals with the ability to seek review, enforcement, or
 17 modification of that injunction.

18 **Second**, even if *Sakkab* could be read as exempting from preemption *McGill*’s prohibition
 19 on agreements that waive the right to seek public injunctive relief in any forum—which it
 20 cannot—that exemption would not aid Plaintiff here because he has not in fact brought a “pure”
 21 claim for public injunctive relief; instead he (unlike the plaintiffs in *McGill*) has brought his
 22
 23

24 ⁹ *See Hansberry v. Lee*, 311 U.S. 32, 41–43 (1940) (adequacy of representation and
 25 commonality of interest required to protect absent plaintiffs); *Concepcion*, 563 U.S. at 349; *cf.*
 26 *Phillips Petroleum Co. v. Shutts*, 472 U.S. 797, 811–12 (1985) (discussing due process rights of
 27 absent class members). Such requirements safeguard the rights of both absent beneficiaries of the
 28 plaintiff’s actions and the named defendant, who wishes—whatever the outcome of the
 litigation—to face but a single representative suit on each particular set of claims. *See Shutts*, 472
 U.S. at 805. It is thus highly unlikely that “public injunction arbitration” would offer the
 “efficient, streamlined procedures” that arbitration typically promises. *Concepcion*, 563 U.S. at
 344.

1 claims *on behalf of, and for the benefit of, a class of California Comcast cable subscribers.*¹⁰
 2 As noted above, however, the *Sakkab* court expressly distinguished PAGA actions from class
 3 proceedings, acknowledging that waivers of the right to bring the latter type of claim were clearly
 4 enforceable under *Concepcion*. See 803 F.3d at 435–36; see also *McGill*, 393 P.3d at 959–60
 5 (permitting UCL/FAL claims for public injunctive relief absent class allegations). Thus, even if
 6 *McGill*’s rule—which invalidates agreements that waive, in any forum, claims that seek public
 7 injunctive relief—was not preempted, that rule would not save Plaintiff’s claims here, which
 8 assert private, putative class claims for injunctive relief.

9 **III. CONCLUSION**

10 For these reasons, and for those set forth in its moving papers, Comcast respectfully
 11 requests that the Court grant its motion to compel individual arbitration and to stay this action.

12 Dated: April 20, 2018

DRINKER BIDDLE & REATH LLP

14 By: /s/ Michael J. Stortz
 15 Michael J. Stortz
 Matthew J. Adler

16 Seamus C. Duffy
 17 Michael W. McTigue Jr.
 Meredith C. Slawe

18 Attorneys for Defendant
 19 COMCAST CABLE COMMUNICATIONS, LLC

20
 21
 22
 23
 24
 25
 26
 27 ¹⁰ See Pl.’s Opp’n at 8; Compl., Prayer for Relief ¶¶ 1(a)–(g) (seeking injunctive relief
 28 requiring Comcast to take certain action vis-à-vis its “cable subscribers”); see also Compl. ¶ 25
 (defining the purported class as “[a]ll persons in California with a residential Comcast cable
 television subscription at any time during the applicable statutory limitations period(s”).